[Read this, and hand it to your Neighbour.]

AN ADDRESS

To the Free Electors of Pennsylvania, who feel an interest in preserving the Military subordinate to the Civil Power.

The approaching election, on the 2d Tuesday of October next, is one of more than ordinary importance to the welfare and prosperity of the State. During the last Session of the Legislature, political doctrines have been broached, hostile to the very existence of a Republican form of Government—and in the election for Chief Magistrate is involved the important question, how far these doctrines are agreeable to the people of the State of Pennsylvania. There are many into whose hands this Address may chance to come, who from conscientious scruples, have a more than usually deep interest at stake, in this question. On common occasions when mere party distinctions are involved, it might not be deemed respectful to appeal to them, with a view to solicit their suffrages in favour of a particular candidate. I know their aversion to mingle in the scenes of political strife and party warfare, and honor their motives. But, there are occasions when the public welfare requires the exertion of every citizen to preserve it, and when duty demands a sacrifice of individual feelings and inclinations for the promotion of the common good.

We all live under a most excellent Constitution—instituted for the peace, safety and happiness of the people, and possessing every safeguard that wisdom and patriotism could devise, to secure them in the enjoyment of their civil and religious rights. A Constitution thus wisely ordered, is a blessing which cannot be too highly appreciated by those who live under its sheltering wings, nor too vigilantly guarded by those who enjoy its protection. It is a common inheritance, which we all have an equal interest in preserving from dilapidation. Such, however, is unfortunately the perverseness of human nature, that blessings in proportion to their excellence, are the subjects of abuse—and our Constitution, wise and excellent as it is, has been virtually assailed in its most vital parts. *The rights of conscience have been wantonly invaded—charters violated—and the military set above the civil power.* I do not mean to be understood that these things have been actually consummated. No,—thanks to the firmness and independence of our present Chief Magistrate, who interposed his authority to prevent these lawless outrages on the liberties of the people. But, these outrages were all attempted to be perpetrated by the Legislature—and their failure furnishes convincing evidence of the value and importance of the office of chief magistrate, in protecting the rights and interests of the people.

The advocates of Legislative power over the Constitution, defeated in all their attempts to exercise arbitrary and despotic power, by an independent executive, find it necessary, in order to accomplish their views, to have a governor of their own selection. Accordingly, they have put in nomination John A. Shulze, a member of their own body—a man whom they know will be subservient to their designs—and who has already furnished evidences of his hostility to our republican institutions, and contempt for the Constitution, by voting in favour of violating the sacred rights of conscience, impairing charters, and placing the military over the civil power. I think it is of importance that you should be made acquainted with the part that John A. Shulze, the Legislative Candidate for the office of Governor, has acted in relation to the measures which have a more immediate bearing on your rights and liberties—measures which will again inevitably be brought forward, should he be the successful candidate—measures, which, if carried into effect, must place you in a painful and delicate situation, if not exile many of you from the State. Under the impression, therefore, that you may not

have been fully informed of the extent of the military spirit and temper displayed by the majority of the Legislature, at the last Session, I have presumed to call your serious attention to the subject.

One of the greatest political evils under which the State has laboured since the late war, is her militia system. Without accomplishing any good purpose whatever, it has always been deplorably burdensome on the great mass of the people—and peculiarly harrassing and oppressive to those who are conscientiously scrupulous of bearing arms. It appears, however, to have been a favourite system with the Legislature for some time past. In their endeavours to render it, what in the militia language is termed *efficient*, the boldest experiments have been made on the liberties of the people. The Senate is quite a military body—two thirds of its members being Major Generals, Brigadier Generals, Colonels and Majors—and to the military committee of the Senate the public is indebted for two very voluminous militia laws—the first of which was passed in 1821, and the last in 1822. The militia law of 1821 contained upwards of eighty sections—introduced novel changes in the old system, and greatly increased the expenses of maintaining it. It had, however, redeeming excellencies, in the estimation of military men, in its numerous compulsory provisions, its severe exactions and heavy penalties. After a trial of six months, it was found not sufficiently *efficient*—and a new system was got up with increased expenses and more rigid exactions. On a short trial of a few months, it was discovered that even this system, with all its severe requisitions, would not answer the purpose of military chieftains, unless the strong arm of the civil power could be tied, and its provisions executed without a responsibility to "the due course of law." A bill was, therefore, introduced by the military committee, entitled,

AN ACT to further restrain Aldermen and Justices of the Peace from taking cognizance of suits against Militia officers.

"BE it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in General Assembly met, and it is hereby enacted by the authority of the same, That if after the passage of this act any alderman or justice of the peace in this commonwealth shall issue process or in any manner whatever commence or take cognizance of any suit or action against a militia officer, constable, collector, or other person concerned in the execution of the militia laws of the commonwealth for any thing done by them or any or either of them under or in pursuance of said militia laws, every alderman or justice of the peace so offending, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor in office, and all his acts and proceedings are hereby declared to be absolutely null and void."

In this first attempt to render the military superior to the civil power, one would naturally look to some great state necessity imperiously demanding it—rebellion at home, or invasion from abroad. Strange to say, it was made in a state of profound peace, and when the country was exempt from the remotest prospect of war. It was made too, to support a system which experience has demonstrated to be oppressive to the people, and utterly inadequate to accomplish the end for which it is designed. However congenial it may be to the feelings of a military man to see the military placed above the civil power, the private citizen who appreciates the Constitution, and the rights and liberties of the people, cannot approve it—nay, must abhor it. And yet John A. Shulze, a private citizen, and an ordained minister of the Prince of Peace, recorded his name in favour of this military edict, so irreconcilable to the genius of a free government, and without even the slightest circumstance of extenuation. Journal of Senate, page 445.

The bill, No. 182, entitled "An act to further restrain alderman and justices of the peace, from taking cognizance of suits against military officers," was read a third time;—and on the question, shall the bill pass?

The yeas and nays were required by Mr. Duncan and Mr. Powers, and are as follows, to wit:—

Yeas—Allshouse, Barnard, Brewster, Conyngham, Fry, *Groves*, Hewington, Hill, Mann, Markley, M'Meens, Orr, Power, SHULZE, R. Smith, St Clair, Marks, *speaker*—17.

Nays—Cadwallader, Coleman, Dewart, Duncan, Feger, Henderson, Killey, Robertson, W. R. Smith, Wurts—10.

Having thus exempted military officers, constables, collectors, and other persons concerned in the execution of the militia law from amenity to the jurisdiction of aldermen and justices of the peace, it was found necessary to proceed a step further. Courts of Justice were still open for redress—and the executioners of the militia law might be there brought to punishment for their illegal conduct. It was, therefore, provided by the 15th section of the bill, entitled "a supplement to the act entitled, "An act for the regulation of the militia of this commonwealth," Journal of Senate, page 510—"that whenever a suit is brought against any military officer, constable, or collector, or other person concerned in the execution of the militia law, in any act or acts, done by virtue, or in pursuance of said laws, the Brigade Inspector is authorized to employ counsel, if necessary, to attend to, and defend the said suit or action, on behalf of the *Commonwealth;* and the reasonable expenses incurred by the Brigade Inspector, in performing said duty, shall be paid in the manner directed in other cases, by the act to which this is a supplement, the same being first allowed and approved of by the Brigadier General." When a suit is, therefore, brought against a military officer, or collector, for alleged illegal conduct in the execution of the military law, the Brigade Inspector and Brigadier General are constituted a military court, and, in the exercise of a mere arbitrary discretion, decide whether the conduct of the officer is legal or illegal. If they should be of opinion that his conduct was legal, it becomes then the affair of the commonwealth, and all the expenses of the suit are to be paid out of the public treasury. Military men are most apt to view acts in a different light from citizens; and conduct which might be pronounced by a civil court and a jury of the country highly oppressive or illegal, might be viewed by a military tribunal perfectly innocent and perhaps praiseworthy. In nine cases out of ten, the decision of the Brigade Inspector and Brigadier General, would be in favour of the military officers and collectors, against whom the suits were brought in the civil court, and thus the public treasury would be burthened with all the expenses of these suits. By this section, the decision of the Brigade Inspector and Brigadier General, exercising *a mere arbitrary discretion*, is made paramount to the verdict of a jury, governed by the *Constitution and civil laws of the Commonwealth*. Call you not this rendering the military superior to the civil power? It is in fact, worse—it operates as an encouragement to military officers, constables, and collectors, to commit acts of violence and oppression, in the execution of the militia law, by removing from them that wholesome restraint, which operates on all who execute the civil laws of the Commonwealth, *at their peril*, and without a public treasury to answer for their misdeeds.

"The military shall, in all cases, and at all times, be in strict subordination to the civil power."—*Constitution.*

"Every man, for an injury done him in his lands, goods, person, or reputation, shall have remedy by due course of law."—*Ibid.*

Not satisfied with the sweeping exemption of military officers, constables, collectors, and other persons concerned in the execution of the militia law from responsibility to the jurisdiction of aldermen and justices of the peace, it is further provided in the 16th section of the same bill—

"SECT. 16. *And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid*, That no alderman or justice of the peace, within the commonwealth, shall issue process, or in any manner whatever, commence or take cognizance of any civil suit or action against any volunteer or militia officer, or *any non-commissioned*

officer or private, acting under their authority, for any thing done by any or either of them, in pursuance and by virtue of the 57th, 58th, and the second article of the 56th sections of the act to which this is a supplement."

But even these palpable violations of the Constitution were not sufficient to satiate the military appetite of the Senate. By the militia law, now in force, a constable or collector to whom any warrant is delivered for the collection of fines, must make a *demand thereof ten days* previous to the levy or collection of the same. By the 6th section of this bill it is provided—

"SECT. 6. *And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid*, That so much of the act to which this is a supplement, as requires the constable or collector, to whom any warrant is delivered, for the collection of fines, to make a demand thereof ten days previous to the levy and collection of the same, be and the same is hereby *repealed*, and in all suits *brought* against a constable or collector, in consequence of any militia fines, he shall be admitted as a witness to prove that demand was made thereof ten day previous to the said levy and collection."

The only argument made use of by the advocates of this section in the Senate, was, that it had been found extremely inconvenient and troublesome to constables and collectors to give this notice. And thus, to indulge constables and collectors of militia fines, the peaceable citizen, whether subject or not to perform militia duty, was to be exposed to their insolence or exactions, without even notice that he had been fined; and, without any previous demand, his property was to be subject to seizure, and his person to imprisonment, by constables, collectors, and other persons concerned in the execution of the militia law, *against whom it was made a misdemeanor in an alderman or justice of the peace to take cognizance of their misdeeds.* The 7th section of this obnoxious bill requires no comment; those who run may read:

"SECT. 7. *And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid*, That in all warrants hereafter issued for the collection of fines, agreeably to the 26th, 28th, and 38th sections of the act, to which this is a supplement, immediately after the words, 'returning the overplus, if any, to the owner,' the following words is hereby authorized to be added, to wit: '*And for want of sufficient goods and chattels, to pay the same, you are hereby required to convey the delinquent to the jail of the proper county, and deliver him to the custody of the sheriff or jailor thereof, to be held and detained by him until he pays the said fine or fines, or is discharged agreeably to the insolvent laws of this commonwealth,*' and which warrants shall then conclude in the form prescribed by the said sections."

Will all these flagrant attempts to render the Military superior to the Civil Power, be patiently submitted to, under a government, in which "the general, great and essential principles of liberty are recognised," by a Constitution which proclaims every man's inherent rights of enjoying and defending life and liberty—of acquiring, possessing and protecting property and reputation, and of pursuing happiness in his own way!!! If such attempts are countenanced by a majority of the people, the character of the Government is rapidly changing from that of a free Republic to a *military despotism.*

But the triumph of the military over the civil power, was not yet complete. Military officers, constables, and collectors, in the execution of the militia law, must be clothed with the armour of *infallibility.* No matter what errors may have been committed by them in the assessment of militia fines, or in the collection of them, or *in any thing appertaining* to the execution of the militia law.—*See*

"SECT. 17. *And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid*, That no want of formality in any return of enrolment, or of absentees, or in the records or returns of any court of appeal or court martial, or in *any other matter or thing required to be done or performed* by officers in the execution of

the militia laws of this commonwealth, shall invalidate the same, or prevent the same being received in evidence, in any court of record, or other judicial tribunal, within this Commonwealth."

" Can such things be,
" And overcome us like a Summer's cloud,
" Without our special wonder?"

To those who are not conscientiously scrupulous of bearing arms, the provisions of these bills must appear arrayed in terrors. To be exposed to the insults and exactions of military officers, constables and collectors of military fines—and be debarred from pursuing a summary mode of redress provided by due course of law—to have the public treasury of the state made use of as a fund to encourage these officers to oppress and harrass the peaceable citizen—to have one's property subject to seizure and person to imprisonment, without one moment's notice—may suit the condition of slaves under a military despotism—but can never be adapted to the character of the citizens of a free republic. Harrassing and oppressive as the provisions of these military bills may be to the citizen who is not conscientiously scrupulous of bearing arms, still by performing the duty exacted of him he may escape many of the impositions which might otherwise be practised on him. He may shoulder a corn-stalk and play his part in the *farce of a military muster:* or, if he prefers it, he may purchase his indulgence at the expense of his purse—and thus add to the amount of those militia fines which never reach the public treasury—but are squandered by militia officers, constables and collectors of militia fines.

But to those who are conscientiously scrupulous of bearing arms, whose sincerity in this tenet of their religion has been established by a uniform and consistent course of conduct, and who cannot make a compromise with this dictate of conscience—who ought to be exempt from the operation of the militia system, and who might fairly claim that exemption, if not as a constitutional right, as a just and equitable privilege—to you there would be no escape from the oppressions and impositions which might have been inflicted on you by the provisions of these odious military bills.

Under the militia law, as it now stands, where military officers, constables, and collectors of militia fines, are responsible to the due course of law, your property has been wantonly sacrificed, and your persons unjustly imprisoned. How much greater wrongs and outrages would be perpetrated, if that responsibility was taken way, your past experience will enable you best to estimate.

That these bills did not become the laws of the land, may be fairly attributed to the firmness and independence displayed by our present chief magistrate. He had resisted every attempt which had been previously made by the Legislature, to violate the Constitution and infringe on the rights of the people. During the pendency of these bills, in the House of Representatives, he had returned, with his objections, the bill violating the religious charter of St. Mary's Church; and the language of the message of the Governor to the Senate, was so plain and positive, that it could not fail to have convinced the majority of the members of the House, that the same course would be pursued in relation to the Militia Bills, containing, as they did, so many palpable violations of the Constitution. Fearful, therefore of the consequences of another defeat, and to avoid the mortification of another triumph over them by the Executive, the House of Representatives were deterred from passing the bills. The man who has voted in favor of them, has evinced either a lamentable ignorance of the character of our Republican Institutions, and the provisions of our excellent Constitution, or a wanton disregard of them. *Military men*, fond of exercising the little brief authority of office attached to the profession of arms, and delighting in " deeds of noble daring," may be considered less blamable for

acting in unison with the military spirit which governs them. But what palliation is there for the conduct of John Andrew Shulze? He had never been a militia officer: nay, he had never mustered as a private on days of training. For, *be it known*, that John A. Shulze is an ordained Minister of the Gospel, and once assumed the sacred functions of a Cleric. He has long since abandoned the Ministry, and relinquished the performance of the duties of that office, which he had voluntarily assumed. He did not, however, relinquish some of the temporal advantages which belonged to it: and as by law a Minister of the Gospel is exempt from the performance of military duty, so, the Rev. John Andrew Shulze has taken advantage of the exemption. He had not then the military feeling or pride of the militia officer, to extenuate his conduct; he was exempted from the performance of militia service, and would not, therefore, be subject to the tyrannical provisions of the acts which were calculated to weigh so heavily on his fellow-citizens. Under these aggravated circumstances, he was friendly to those military measures, which have for their object the subversion of the civil rights of the people. John A. Shulze stands pledged in favour of these Bills. In the event of his election to the office of Chief Magistrate, the temper of the next Legislature will be the same: these Bills will necessarily be revived, and must become laws. The snake is only *scotch'd*, not killed: the success of the Legislative candidate will impart to the monster new strength and vigour, and there will then exist no antidote to its increased venom.

There is another measure which formed the subject of the deliberations of the last Legislature, indicative of a temper and disposition hostile to the peace and well-being of the community.—It is a measure well worthy the serious consideration not only of those who may be sufferers from it, but of all good citizens who have a proper regard for just principles, and a fair and equitable administration of the Government.

I allude to the subject of the Militia Fines assessed on the citizens of this State, for non-performance of militia duty during the late war. It is well known, that Pennsylvania furnished more than the quota of militia-men demanded of her during the war, and that the quota was principally composed of Volunteers. The United States could not, therefore, have any just and equitable claims on the citizens of Pennsylvania, for any delinquencies. Claims, however, were made by the General Government, and fines were assessed on the citizens to an enormous amount; and a considerable portion of these fines were collected. I am induced to believe, that the General Government was rather passive in the assessment and collection of these fines—and that the active agents were militia officers, who received extravagant wages for serving on courts martial, and United States' marshals and their deputies, who took good care to avail themselves of the golden opportunity of plunder. Certain it is, that on the first solicitation of the State Government, Congress relinquished to it all the fines that had been assessed and collected under the authority of the General Government.

During the last session, the Legislature, for the first time, had the power of relieving the citizens from the exactions of these oppressive and unjust fines which had been assessed, as far as the trial had been made, for the benefit of members of courts martial and United States' officers. It would have been most certainly, more consonant to a just and benevolent course of policy in the Legislature, to have passed an act of oblivion in relation to those fines. Such, however, was not the temper and disposition of the last Legislature. At an early period of the session, the Committee of Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, took the subject into consideration, and made a report to the House, in which it was *unanimously* recommended to *exact the utmost farthing of these fines!* This report is of so vindictive a character, that I deem it proper to present you with some extracts from it.

EXTRACTS FROM THE REPORT.

"In order to enable the Legislature to act *understandingly* on this subject, the following statement is respectfully submitted:

"Of the whole amount of fines originally assessed, amounting to 351,981 dols. 66 cts. there has been collected 119,257 dols. 99 cts. Of this sum 71,322 dols. 36 cts. appears to be wholly lost by the insolvency of the late marshal, John Smith, and his sureties: to this sum may be added 41,556 dols. 33 cts. which, according to the statement of the said John Smith, has been paid to *members of courts martial*, by him and his deputies."

"Of the remaining 232,723 dols. 67 cts. 44,404 dols. 17 cts. have been remitted by the Governor of this Commonwealth; leaving a balance yet to be collected, or in the hands of deputy marshals, of 188,319 dols. 50 cts."

"Your committee would further remark, that no returns have been received from the following counties, viz.—Mifflin, part of Centre, Somerset, Cambria, Cumberland, Perry, Fayette, Green, and part of Washington, Allegheny, Armstrong, Indiana, Jefferson, Beaver, Mercer, Crawford, Erie, Butler, Venango, and Warren. In some of those counties, it is said, courts martial have been held, particularly in one, *where the expenses of the court far exceeds the amount of the fines assessed.*"

"Having thus submitted to the House all the information your committee possess, they would respectfully remark, that although the *whole amount* of fines collected by the officers of the United States, has been *sunk* in the collection, and in the insolvency of the late marshal and his sureties—a *fact*, which goes very far to show that *little or no advantage* is likely to be realized by virtue of the investing act: they are, *notwithstanding*, *unanimously* of opinion, that it would be unjust and impolitic to suffer *the business to rest in its present situation.* Many of our citizens have already been compelled to pay for their delinquency: it surely would be very improper to suffer others, equally negligent, to escape!! Besides, if a militia-man refuse to march when drafted, he knew the *alternative*—and should the Legislature omit to exact the penalty—the effects of such a course might be VERY DELETERIOUS IN CASE OF FUTURE WARS." *Journals of the House*—106.

See, then, how such a measure comes recommended! Its principle, assuming justice for its basis, is founded on the grossest injustice; its motives is vengeance—and its adoption is advocated on the ground, not of an equivalent for services withheld, but of *exemplary punishment*, after a lapse of ten years, for the purpose of making the people more obedient and docile in case of *future wars.* The sentiments of this report are derogatory to the characters of the representatives of a free people, intrusted with an important part in the administration of a Government instituted for their peace, safety and happiness: it breathes a vindictive spirit, and is rather the language of a despot who governs his subjects by force, and overawes them by terror.

This report was adopted by the House, and was followed up by a bill in the Senate, which is to be found on the Senate files, No. 255. The bill directs the auditor general to furnish the brigade inspectors with the lists of fines assessed on the citizens of the Commonwealth for the non-performance of militia duty in the late war—orders the brigade inspectors to proceed forthwith to collect the fines therein mentioned—and directs the auditor general to settle all the accounts of members of courts martial who had been employed in the assessment of these fines, and who, it appears, have large claims remaining unsettled. The bill was not reached in the Senate until a few days previous to the adjournment of the Legislature; and to this circumstance its failure is to be principally attributed.

Although it is admitted in the Report of the Committee of Ways and Means that the whole amount of fines, 119,257 dols. 99 cts. collected by the U. States' officers, has been *sunk* in the collection, and that little or no advantage is likely to be realized by the investing act, yet the committee is *unanimously* of opinion, that the omission of the Legislature to *exact the penalty* might be very *deleterious in case of future wars!!!* The sum of 188,000 dols. is

therefore to be levied on the people without any advantage to the State, to be *sunk* in the collection of it, for the benefit of members of courts martial, brigade inspectors, and their deputy collectors—and all this by way of *exemplary punishment* after a lapse of ten years.—Like very Shylocks—they must have the pound of flesh.

When such a measure is in agitation, and is thus advocated by a Legislature entrusted with the guardianship of the commonweal, you cannot remain passive when the opportunity arrives of expressing public opinion of it. You cannot say that you have no lot or part in this matter.

The event of the approaching Election will decide whether this PENALTY is to be exacted of the people. Should John A. Shulze be elected, the complexion of the next Legislature will not differ from the last—and independently of the evidence of his military predilections furnished by his vote in favour of rendering the military superior to the civil power—he will be indebted to the Legislature for his elevation to office, and will not dare to thwart any of their measures, however impolitic, unjust, or unconstitutional.

Many of you, from sad experience, know that the collection of those fines already made, under the laws as they now exist, with a responsibility in the collectors to the due course of law—property, in many instances quadruple the amount of the fine, has been wantonly sacrificed. I pray you, what would be the excesses, the frauds and impositions, practised in the collection of the remaining fines, if all responsibility to the only competent authority to afford suitable redress of grievances, was taken away, and no check existed, save the conscience of constable or collector? Verily, 500,000 dols. would not pay the *penalty*.

In every point of view, then, in which the approaching Election is considered, there is occasion for serious alarm. The most valuable and sacred provisions of the Constitution, and the best interests of society, are involved in the contest. In proportion to threatened dangers, should be the exertions to avert them—and when the Constitution has provided the means of avoiding the impending evils, the only course which prudence dictates is the use of them. Preventive measures are always the safest and wisest, and have the additional recommendation of being the mildest.

Should you withhold your votes, and John A. Shulze be the successful candidate—and should it afterwards appear from the state of the polls, that your votes would have produced a different result—would you not consider yourselves justly chargeable with being accessary to all the bad consequences of his mal-administration of office, and to the extravagant proceedings of a Legislature no longer governed by the restraint of an independent and upright Executive? Could you, under such circumstances, claim the interference of the Judiciary to protect you from their lawless outrages on your civil or religious rights, with the same satisfaction as if you had assisted to prevent the injustice of which you complained? Think of these things before it is too late.

But it does appear to me, that you are peculiarly called on to exercise the elective franchise on the approaching occasion. To the enlightened wisdom of the philanthropic PENN, the world is indebted for the first political recognition of the sacred rights of conscience, as the unalienable and indefeasable rights of man; and its incorporation in our most excellent Constitution, must be esteemed one of its brightest features. That the first attempt to invade this sacred principle should have been made in the land which gave it political existence, is an event grievously to be lamented. But it would furnish occasion for still deeper humiliation, if the man who wantonly aided in this attempt, should receive, as the reward of his conduct, the highest honour and the first office in the gift of the people. The bare possibility of such an event will lead you to the polls. It is a duty you owe to the vindication of the principles of the illustrious Founder of the State—a duty you owe to yourselves as you value his institutions, and would wish to secure them to your posterity. Your votes will not only assist to keep bad men out of office—but you will have the satisfaction of being assured that they will contribute to put a good man into office.

If respectable talents and a mind improved by useful knowledge, and strengthened by long experience, political integrity and private virtue, rewarded by the confidence of the people, and established by long tried public services, amiable manners and modest deportment, are worthy of your confidence, these qualities are all united in the character of Andrew Gregg. An honourable life of sixty-five years, exhibits a private character irreproachable, and a political career of twenty-two years service in the councils of the nation, creditable to himself and useful to his country. Indeed, under existing circumstances, he is the candidate peculiarly suited to the crisis—and of all the persons, he is the most proper to place in the chair of state.

John A. Shulze, is the candidate identified with all the violent and unconstitutional measures of our last Legislature, and Andrew Gregg, as a member of the present administration, is identified with the firm and upright executive opposition to them. His success over the Legislative candidate, would therefore, constitute a stronger, and more decided and emphatical expression of public opinion. In such an appeal to the people, no vote should be lost—for every vote will swell the triumph of the Constitution over is enemies—will display the strength of its friends, and thus tend to fix more firmly the *charter of our civil and religious rights* in the affections of the people.

Philadelphia: Printed by J. Richards, No. 20, Church Alley.